

| | | |
|---|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 09/943,286 | NUNOMURA, KIYOTADA |
| | Examiner Teresa E Strzelecka | Art Unit 1637 |

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) Teresa E Strzelecka.

(3) _____.

(2) Michael J. Gilly.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 26 January 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

105

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Teresa Strzelecka
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Mr. Gilly was contacted in a follow-up to the interview on January 25, 2004. The proposed claim language was approved by Examiner Fredman, but some grammatical issues needed sorting out. Mr. Gilley was presented with two versions of the proposed changes for claim 105 by e-mail (copy included), and confirmed the second version. Mr. Gilley authorized the changes to be made by Examiner's amendment..